

than a personal policy. Hence the constitutional settlement which followed the Revolution did not simply restore the old state of things in America. Connecticut and Rhode Island, but not Massachusetts, got back their forfeited charters. Massachusetts received, instead, a new constitution which vested in the Crown the appointment of its governor and in the governor a veto over the appointment of the Council and the laws passed by the Assembly. The King took the government of Maryland into his own hands and for the next generation it was a royal province instead of a proprietary colony. In New York, though representative government was restored, the act in which the Assembly defined the rights of the colony was annulled by William on the ground that it granted 'too great and unreasonable privileges.'¹ In short, while the result of the Revolution was to restore representative government, it strengthened the authority of the Crown and tightened the bonds between the colonies and England.

In another way too the history of the American colonies is closely connected with that of England. The struggle between France and England, which began in Europe after the accession of William III, was beginning in America during the reign of James. In 1686 three forts of the Hudson's Bay Company were captured by an expedition

from Canada under d'Iberville, while Denonville, the governor of Canada, attacked the Iroquois, and Dongan, the governor of New York, allied himself with them.² Long before the War of the Austrian Succession, 'Red men scalped each other by the Great Lakes of North America'³ to serve

¹ Ibid. p. 287 ; J. A. Doyle, *The Middle Colonies* (1907), p. 286.

- See Doyle, *Middle Colonies*, pp. 222-34 "> and, above all, Francis Parkman's *Frontenac and New France*.

³ Macaulay, *Essay on Frederic the Great*, in *Essays*, iii. 196.